

## **BAY CITY AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY (BCATS)**

Policy Committee Minutes - February 17, 2010

Page 1

---

### **Call To Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 9:58 a.m.

Those present were: Dave Engelhardt, BCATS staff; Dale Majerczyk, City of Essexville; Gary Brandt, Monitor Township Supervisor; George Augustyniak, Fraser Township Supervisor; Terry Spegel, Hampton Township Supervisor; Dennis Bragiel, Kawkawlin Township Supervisor; John Gaydos, City of Bay City; Susan Richardson, MDOT Planning; Jim Lillo, Bay County Road Commission; Vaughn Begick, Bay County; Dirk Westbury, BCATS staff, and; Cyndi Gaul, EA&CD.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

It was moved by Gaydos, seconded by Augustyniak, to approve the minutes from the December 16, 2009 meeting. Motion Passed.

### **Public Comment:**

There was no public comment brought before the committee.

### **Update From Bay Metro Transit:**

Stoner was not present. Engelhardt gave a very brief update regarding the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study. A study of the traffic corridor between Bay City and Detroit is being done by Genesee County Metropolitan Planning Commission/Flint MTA to determine if having a Bus Rapid Transit route between the two cities would be beneficial.

### **New Federal Highway Bill Update:**

Engelhardt said that there wasn't anything new to report on the Federal Highway Bill. Richardson said that the extended Authorization Bill ends on February 28, 2010. There is no new bill in place. Richardson didn't have any further updates. Richardson said that the obligation authority is going to be slow for the STP funds until a new bill is passed. First STP funds that are combined with ARRA fund projects will be released, then any STP for local jobs today funded projects and finally the regular STP funded projects. Richardson recommended that the agencies keep track of any interest paid for job today loans because there is a chance that such payments may be paid back.

### **ARRA II - Jobs for Main Street Update:**

Engelhardt discussed the possibility of another ARRA program which would be called Jobs for Main Street (J4MS). J4MS is expected to be run the same as ARRA, however, there is expected to be a 90-day contract award clause. This fast turn around time is a major concern. If J4MS goes through, it is very likely that I-75 Linwood Road to the County Line will be one of the projects as this is a top State priority. It will be important to get this project into the TIP if the J4MS funding comes through.

### **Public Hearing on BCATS 2008-11 TIP Amendments - MDOT & Bay Metro:**

The Public Hearing was called to order at 10:06 a.m. by Dale Majerczyk, Chairman of BCATS. The purpose of the Public Hearing was to discuss the various MDOT and Bay Metro amendments to the BCATS 2008-11 TIP. Engelhardt discussed the handout of the MDOT and Bay Metro amendments that were provided with the agenda packet. The MDOT additions include the I-75 and M-13 bridge projects. Bay Metro additions are basically bringing forth projects that were previously unfunded and making operating cost corrections. Begick asked if

## **BAY CITY AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY (BCATS)**

Policy Committee Minutes - February 17, 2010

Page 2

---

he could get a list of all of the MDOT bridges included in the project. Augustyniak said that he would also like a list of bridges. Westbury said there are nine bridges in Bay County. Westbury said that he would get the list of bridges, along with their locations, and email the information.

The Public Hearing on the MDOT and Bay Metro Amendments to the BCATS FY 2008-11 TIP was adjourned at 10:12 a.m.

The regular BCATS Policy Committee Meeting was reconvened at 10:12 a.m.

### **Approval of the MDOT and Bay Metro Amendments to the BCATS 2008-11 TIP:**

A motion was made by Gaydos, seconded by Begick, to approve the MDOT and Bay Metro TIP Amendments as listed. Motion Passed.

### **BCATS 2011-12-13-14 TIP Local Project Recommendations (Tier II):**

Engelhardt gave everyone a handout of the recommended local project additions to the BCATS 2011-12-13-14 TIP as well as an illustrative list of projects should additional funding become available. The list includes possible projects that have been identified base on surface condition, traffic volume and relationship to a DDA within BCATS. While no action is required today, Engelhardt would like everyone to review the projects and review the funding. At the next BCATS Policy Committee Meeting, Engelhardt would like to have the draft TIP ready for committee approval.

Majerczyk provided information on the proposed railroad project in Essexville. The project would address the rail travel across Woodside Avenue where 90% of the coal train cars cross need to head east, but have to go west based on the current configuration of the tracks, before breaking up the cars in order to travel east. The project would create a "Y" to include a way to move trains through this crossing faster and safer, and allow direct access traveling east. The estimated cost for this project is \$1.2 million. Richardson was concerned about the possibility of using road money for rails. Majerczyk explained that any BCATS money used for the project would only be on in the Woodside Ave ROW and the rail company would pay for everything else. Spegel expressed his concern regarding railroad crossings in Bay County, specifically the one on Center Ave. Spegel wondered why the railroad crossing wasn't done at the same time as the road work on M-25 was being done. Majerczyk suggested contacting the railroad directly. Majerczyk said that when he contacted the railroad regarding the Woodside Ave ROW project, he spoke with Mark Naggy and Beck Chumura. Right now they are waiting to see what the railroad will be doing.

Engelhardt further discussed the BCATS 2011-12-13-14 TIP local project recommendations including the Tier II illustrative list for possible Jobs for Main Street funding. Engelhardt also pointed out that the financial figures on the bottom of the table are estimates. Engelhardt reiterating the importance of having projects ready to go at a moments notice and asked if the group would support granting him special administrative modification authority. Engelhardt asked Richardson for clarification of the use of Urban Area Funds. As he understood it, Urban Area Funds can get spent in Rural Areas. However, Rural Area Funds can't be used for Urban Areas. Richardson said that was correct.

A motion was made by Majerczyk, seconded by Lillo, to grant Dave Engelhardt special administrative modification authority to make changes on the BCATS 2008-11 TIP with regards

## **BAY CITY AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY (BCATS)**

Policy Committee Minutes - February 17, 2010

Page 3

---

to projects on the Tier II prioritized list if additional funding became available, with agreement from the implementing agencies, as long as he is given e-mail approval by the corresponding implementing agencies. Motion passed.

### **Non-Motorized Plan Update:**

Westbury gave an update on the Non-Motorized Plan and discussed the creation of a Non-Motorized Plan Sub-Committee that would consist of a variety of interested persons. The purpose of the sub-committee would be to focus on the BCATS area and look at ways to improve non-motorized transportation into existing roads and trails. Engelhardt felt that there should be a smaller core group to start the sub-committee and that we would build on that core group. He said he would like to have a representative from the local cyclist group participate in this sub-committee to get feedback. It would also be important to see what the township visions are for their area in regards to their own non-motorized plan(s). Engelhardt said that he would be setting up the first meeting in early March. If anyone is interested in this sub-committee they should contact Dave Engelhardt.

### **Travel Demand Model:**

Engelhardt explained that the Travel Demand Model S/E data is being updated in order to have a more current base year which, and provide the ability to project areas of future growth or decline for modeling purposes. Engelhardt will be contacting the township offices to gather this updated socio/economic data, along with building permits and demolition permits.

### **2010 Digital Orthophotography:**

Engelhardt discussed that Bay County still plans to acquire digital Orthophotography in 2010. The last fly for digital orthophotography was back in 2005. Engelhardt believes the digital orthophotography has been a very useful tool for the townships and cities. This project is being funded through various county departments, specific funding from Dow Chemical, and the Bay County Road Commission and there will be no requests for funds from townships or cities to facilitate the 2010 fly for digital orthophotography. Engelhardt would like to talk to people in the townships and cities to see the ways they are utilizing aerial photography and tax parcel information and to find out if there are things the GIS Division can/should do to promote more data use. Majerczyk and Augustyniak said that their organizations use the information quite a bit and that they see the value of having updated information.

### **Project Updates:**

The Road Commission and City of Bay City are working jointly on the ***Wilder Road/Truman Parkway Project*** which will be let in April, 2010. The ***Johnson Street Project*** which could be part of the ARRA/Jobs for Main Street funding, has been sent to MDOT Local Agencies in Lansing for review. The ***Midland Road Project*** is currently under initial design review and the soils are being tested. The ***Borton Ave project*** is out to bid and will have a March 5, 2010 let. It is anticipated that construction of this project will begin in June, 2010. The ***M-84 Projects*** will start in March with the complete closure of the bridge over I-75. The bridge will be reopened in 98 days. The road work will be completed in two phases, from Delta Rd to 2 Mile Rd this year and from 2 Mile Rd to Euclid Ave in 2011.

### **Other/New Business:**

#### ***Traffic Control:***

Gaydos expressed his concern about traffic control with all the closures scheduled during

## **BAY CITY AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY (BCATS)**

Policy Committee Minutes - February 17, 2010

Page 4

---

high traffic time in the City of Bay City. With the various summer festivals that bring people in to the city, particularly the 4<sup>th</sup> of July fireworks festival and the Tall Ships Festival, it's important to have good traffic control. Gaydos will work with MDOT to ensure traffic control isn't a problem.

### ***Asphalt Patches:***

Spegel wanted to know why roads couldn't be patched using asphalt like they are with concrete by cutting out a portion of the bad area and replacing the material. Gaydos explained that the properties of asphalt were very different from concrete so it doesn't set up or work like concrete. Lillo said that the compaction on base when doing asphalt patches isn't very easy to get right, and could result in a bad repair.

### ***Municipalities Revert Back to Gravel Roads:***

Gaydos received a letter regarding how many municipalities are finding that the rising cost to fix roads along with a lack of funding is forcing them to revert roads back to gravel roads. The City of Bay City is looking at this as a possibility right now. Roads that have 150 vehicles or less in traffic, may be candidates for reversion to a gravel surface.

As there was no further business, the February 17, 2010 BCATS Policy Committee meeting was adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Engelhardt  
BCATS Director

*Transcribed by C. Gaul*

*G:\Transportation Planning\01-BCATS\01-Policy Committee\FY 2010\2010 BCATS Policy Minutes\2010-02-17 BCATS Policy mtg min.wpd*

City/Township	POP. 2005	OCC. HH 2005	PER HH 2005	Pop. 2009	Occ. HH 2009	Per HH 2009	Change in Pop. '05- '09	Total EMP '05	Total EMP '09	Change in EMP '05- '09
Auburn	2047	893	2.29	2008	903	2.22	(39)	791	792	1
Bangor	15394	6624	2.32	15102	6793	2.22	(292)	7586	6954	(632)
Bay City*	34500	15218	2.27	31824	15202	2.09	(2676)	15771	13835	(1936)
Beaver	2947	1054	2.80	3001	1079	2.78	54	224	377	153
Essexville	3687	1490	2.47	3535	1494	2.37	(152)	732	710	(22)
Frankenlust*	2938	1265	2.32	3341	1453	2.30	403	1412	1869	457
Fraser	3439	1346	2.55	3304	1358	2.43	(135)	721	658	(63)
Garfield	1875	669	2.80	1895	680	2.79	20	78	180	102
Gibson	1228	441	2.78	1374	455	3.02	146	24	86	62
Hampton	9529	4322	2.20	9519	4351	2.19	(10)	4126	3217	(909)
Kawkawlin	5153	2005	2.57	5021	2023	2.48	(132)	1355	1468	113
Merritt	1422	549	2.59	1381	559	2.47	(41)	157	217	60
Midland (In Bay Co.)	222	95	2.34	236	102	2.31	14	12	251	239
Monitor	13895	5471	2.54	13620	5560	2.45	(275)	5086	4821	(265)
Mt. Forest	1424	542	2.63	1454	559	2.60	30	107	189	82
Pinconning	1338	621	2.15	1273	622	2.05	(65)	1220	822	(398)
Pinconning Twp	2639	1033	2.55	2513	1045	2.40	(126)	476	489	13
Portsmouth	3631	1471	2.47	3514	1476	2.38	(117)	552	656	104
Williams	4863	1804	2.70	4866	1858	2.62	3	1858	1915	57

\*Population data for middlegrounds (TAZ 464) is part of Frankenlust Twp. Totals, while employment for TAZ 464 is part of the Bay City totals.

**Bay County Traffic Analysis Zones - 2009 Base year Population and Total Employment**

TAZ	POP. 2005	OCC. HH 2005	PER HH 2005	Pop. 2009	Occ. HH 2009	Per HH 2009	Change in Pop. '05-'09	Total EMP '05	Total EMP '09	Change in EMP '05-'09	City/Township
320	216	118	1.83	197	118	1.81	(19)	125	128	3	Auburn
321	490	191	2.57	447	191	2.54	(43)	301	274	(27)	Auburn
322	1158	469	2.47	1181	478	2.47	23	312	341	29	Auburn
323	183	115	1.59	183	116	1.58	0	53	49	(4)	Auburn
354	390	178	2.19	356	177	2.17	(34)	33	86	53	Bangor
355	1116	473	2.36	1020	456	2.34	(96)	59	67	8	Bangor
356	427	161	2.65	438	163	2.69	11	159	161	2	Bangor
357	876	328	2.67	892	335	2.66	16	66	112	46	Bangor
358	563	219	2.57	560	220	2.55	(3)	9	33	24	Bangor
359	980	425	2.31	896	414	2.28	(84)	101	173	72	Bangor
360	399	156	2.56	365	156	2.53	(34)	6	33	27	Bangor
361	866	379	2.28	792	378	2.26	(74)	46	77	31	Bangor
362	908	358	2.54	904	360	2.51	(4)	151	139	(12)	Bangor
363	129	50	2.58	118	50	2.55	(11)	12	9	(3)	Bangor
364	168	62	2.71	169	63	2.68	1	2	8	6	Bangor
365	530	210	2.52	484	207	2.50	(46)	89	87	(2)	Bangor
366	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	96	79	(17)	Bangor
367	216	75	2.88	217	76	2.85	1	517	278	(239)	Bangor
368	520	207	2.51	522	208	2.51	2	187	146	(41)	Bangor
369	401	288	1.39	658	457	1.44	257	1472	1127	(345)	Bangor
370	113	51	2.22	103	51	2.20	(10)	529	538	9	Bangor
371	367	167	2.20	335	163	2.18	(32)	69	99	30	Bangor
372	130	52	2.50	137	53	2.59	7	507	343	(164)	Bangor
373	34	16	2.13	36	17	2.10	2	211	110	(101)	Bangor
374	1493	601	2.48	1506	610	2.47	13	308	313	5	Bangor
375	707	301	2.35	715	305	2.35	8	1113	1004	(109)	Bangor
376	1045	465	2.25	1045	466	2.24	0	164	216	52	Bangor
377	734	312	2.35	671	312	2.33	(63)	445	551	106	Bangor
378	1135	550	2.06	1037	550	2.04	(98)	556	380	(176)	Bangor
379	298	156	1.91	272	156	1.89	(26)	494	551	57	Bangor
380	461	210	2.20	461	212	2.17	0	148	179	31	Bangor
381	388	174	2.23	393	178	2.21	5	37	55	18	Bangor
382	472	230	2.05	423	223	2.03	(49)	575	343	(232)	Bay City
383	1137	476	2.39	1139	477	2.39	2	350	327	(23)	Bay City
384	313	158	1.98	280	157	1.96	(33)	94	106	12	Bay City
385	314	137	2.29	281	137	2.27	(33)	178	263	85	Bay City
386	317	149	2.13	284	149	2.11	(33)	49	44	(5)	Bay City
387	25	10	2.50	22	10	2.48	(3)	124	72	(52)	Bay City
388	369	151	2.44	331	151	2.42	(38)	53	45	(8)	Bay City
389	311	137	2.27	279	136	2.25	(32)	6	27	21	Bay City
390	292	204	1.43	262	204	1.42	(30)	213	195	(18)	Bay City
391	18	5	3.60	16	5	3.56	(2)	19	107	88	Bay City
392	248	107	2.32	222	107	2.30	(26)	27	30	3	Bay City
393	135	59	2.29	121	58	2.27	(14)	13	11	(2)	Bay City
394	305	136	2.24	273	136	2.22	(32)	232	203	(29)	Bay City
395	666	290	2.30	597	289	2.29	(69)	225	215	(10)	Bay City
396	1207	532	2.27	1081	532	2.25	(126)	300	360	60	Bay City
397	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	22	12	(10)	Bay City
398	4	3	1.33	4	3	1.32	0	59	35	(24)	Bay City
399	2	2	1.00	2	2	1.00	0	88	97	9	Bay City
400	36	25	1.44	32	25	1.43	(4)	115	48	(67)	Bay City
401	46	24	1.92	41	24	1.90	(5)	32	12	(20)	Bay City
402	97	42	2.31	87	42	2.29	(10)	27	23	(4)	Bay City
403	618	260	2.38	614	261	2.35	(4)	28	48	20	Bay City
404	791	342	2.31	709	341	2.31	(82)	132	91	(41)	Bay City
405	821	353	2.33	824	354	2.33	3	214	219	5	Bay City
406	860	362	2.38	771	360	2.35	(89)	70	103	33	Bay City
407	1174	506	2.32	1052	506	2.30	(122)	79	97	18	Bay City
408	100	48	2.08	90	48	2.06	(10)	106	140	34	Bay City
409	828	364	2.27	742	364	2.25	(86)	253	369	116	Bay City
410	374	160	2.34	335	159	2.31	(39)	66	44	(22)	Bay City
411	453	189	2.40	451	190	2.37	(2)	20	26	6	Bay City

**Bay County Traffic Analysis Zones - 2009 Base year Population and Total Employment**

TAZ	POP. 2005	OCC. HH 2005	PER HH 2005	Pop. 2009	Occ. HH 2009	Per HH 2009	Change in Pop. '05-'09	Total EMP '05	Total EMP '09	Change in EMP '05-'09	City/Township
412	41	19	2.16	37	19	2.14	(4)	638	397	(241)	Bay City
413	49	24	2.04	44	24	2.02	(5)	137	139	2	Bay City
414	60	22	2.73	54	22	2.70	(6)	256	90	(166)	Bay City
415	44	17	2.59	39	17	2.56	(5)	1606	717	(889)	Bay City
416	0	0	0.00	28	17	1.64	28	151	182	31	Bay City
417	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	671	460	(211)	Bay City
418	536	326	1.64	534	328	1.63	(2)	243	223	(20)	Bay City
419	206	84	2.45	185	83	2.43	(21)	104	159	55	Bay City
420	253	113	2.24	227	113	2.22	(26)	49	56	7	Bay City
421	584	234	2.50	523	234	2.48	(61)	3	8	5	Bay City
422	628	274	2.29	563	273	2.27	(65)	45	27	(18)	Bay City
423	395	173	2.28	354	172	2.29	(41)	135	100	(35)	Bay City
424	284	113	2.51	254	113	2.48	(30)	6	8	2	Bay City
425	295	122	2.42	264	122	2.40	(31)	51	70	19	Bay City
426	327	145	2.26	293	145	2.24	(34)	65	89	24	Bay City
427	481	260	1.85	431	260	1.83	(50)	219	184	(35)	Bay City
428	4	1	4.00	5	3	1.67	1	636	690	54	Bay City
429	1	1	1.00	1	1	1.00	0	351	318	(33)	Bay City
430	18	12	1.50	16	12	1.49	(2)	203	213	10	Bay City
431	58	35	1.66	52	35	1.64	(6)	41	152	111	Bay City
432	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	6	6	0	Bay City
433	2	1	2.00	2	1	1.98	0	184	183	(1)	Bay City
434	20	10	2.00	18	9	1.98	(2)	362	188	(174)	Bay City
435	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	76	0	(76)	Bay City
436	54	17	3.18	48	17	3.15	(6)	38	76	38	Bay City
437	946	570	1.66	970	572	1.70	24	150	171	21	Bay City
438	354	144	2.46	317	144	2.44	(37)	65	81	16	Bay City
439	223	88	2.53	223	89	2.51	0	63	78	15	Bay City
440	466	191	2.44	418	191	2.42	(48)	44	53	9	Bay City
441	343	141	2.43	307	141	2.41	(36)	93	108	15	Bay City
442	25	13	1.92	22	13	1.90	(3)	6	10	4	Bay City
443	420	177	2.37	376	173	2.35	(44)	10	15	5	Bay City
444	721	276	2.61	646	276	2.58	(75)	32	49	17	Bay City
445	1125	456	2.47	1008	453	2.50	(117)	216	184	(32)	Bay City
446	370	175	2.11	332	173	2.09	(38)	316	226	(90)	Bay City
447	20	15	1.33	26	20	1.32	6	550	360	(190)	Bay City
448	952	484	1.97	853	482	2.03	(99)	188	172	(16)	Bay City
449	1321	611	2.16	1184	610	2.14	(137)	178	166	(12)	Bay City
450	1213	504	2.41	1087	504	2.39	(126)	204	204	0	Bay City
451	861	394	2.19	857	396	2.16	(4)	153	158	5	Bay City
452	15	6	2.50	13	6	2.48	(2)	2317	1950	(367)	Bay City
453	9	3	3.00	8	3	2.97	(1)	6	0	(6)	Bay City
454	1305	574	2.27	1169	573	2.27	(136)	72	254	182	Bay City
455	805	319	2.52	721	318	2.54	(84)	176	208	32	Bay City
456	710	287	2.47	708	289	2.45	(2)	152	95	(57)	Bay City
457	743	293	2.54	666	293	2.51	(77)	248	259	11	Bay City
458	2	2	1.00	2	2	1.00	0	53	56	3	Bay City
459	1125	429	2.62	1141	430	2.65	16	108	69	(39)	Bay City
460	846	353	2.40	758	352	2.37	(88)	96	112	16	Bay City
461	1092	502	2.18	978	500	2.15	(114)	36	67	31	Bay City
462	262	95	2.76	235	95	2.73	(27)	3	21	18	Bay City
463	825	352	2.34	739	333	2.33	(86)	35	54	19	Bay City
464	91	34	2.68	82	34	2.65	(9)	38	53	15	Middlegrounds
465	728	300	2.43	723	301	2.40	(5)	118	155	37	Bay City
276	179	61	2.93	198	64	3.10	19	3	12	9	Beaver
277	183	66	2.77	192	70	2.75	9	14	30	16	Beaver
278	423	155	2.73	396	155	2.70	(27)	28	63	35	Beaver
279	851	304	2.80	870	314	2.77	19	71	102	31	Beaver
280	514	192	2.68	530	193	2.75	16	56	68	12	Beaver
281	370	124	2.98	372	126	2.95	2	14	29	15	Beaver
282	65	26	2.50	69	28	2.48	4	26	32	6	Beaver
283	209	74	2.82	217	75	2.89	8	1	23	22	Beaver

**Bay County Traffic Analysis Zones - 2009 Base year Population and Total Employment**

TAZ	POP. 2005	OCC. HH 2005	PER HH 2005	Pop. 2009	Occ. HH 2009	Per HH 2009	Change in Pop. '05-'09	Total EMP '05	Total EMP '09	Change in EMP '05-'09	City/Township
284	153	52	2.94	157	54	2.91	4	11	18	7	Beaver
466	8	3	2.67	7	3	2.64	(1)	28	23	(5)	Essexville
467	398	172	2.31	357	172	2.29	(41)	34	48	14	Essexville
468	670	262	2.56	666	263	2.53	(4)	23	47	24	Essexville
469	806	324	2.49	723	324	2.47	(83)	31	31	0	Essexville
470	56	24	2.33	50	24	2.31	(6)	127	118	(9)	Essexville
471	720	297	2.42	715	298	2.40	(5)	3	14	11	Essexville
472	958	379	2.53	954	381	2.51	(4)	167	171	4	Essexville
473	25	12	2.08	22	12	2.06	(3)	249	179	(70)	Essexville
474	46	17	2.71	41	17	2.68	(5)	70	79	9	Essexville
517	89	36	2.47	86	36	2.45	(3)	0	9	9	Frankenlust
518	150	56	2.68	145	56	2.65	(5)	7	16	9	Frankenlust
519	158	60	2.63	153	60	2.60	(5)	173	165	(8)	Frankenlust
520	12	4	3.00	12	4	2.97	0	0	0	0	Frankenlust
521	260	105	2.48	265	108	2.45	5	107	69	(38)	Frankenlust
522	88	34	2.59	108	42	2.56	20	2	2	0	Frankenlust
523	690	387	1.78	725	411	1.77	35	336	338	2	Frankenlust
524	433	175	2.47	735	300	2.45	302	42	61	19	Frankenlust
525	310	118	2.63	330	127	2.60	20	87	138	51	Frankenlust
526	7	1	7.00	7	1	6.93	0	628	1000	372	Frankenlust
527	425	177	2.40	442	186	2.38	17	24	38	14	Frankenlust
528	225	78	2.88	251	88	2.86	26	6	33	27	Frankenlust
251	103	42	2.45	93	42	2.43	(10)	3	21	18	Fraser
252	27	10	2.70	24	10	2.67	(3)	0	0	0	Fraser
253	107	42	2.55	97	42	2.52	(10)	6	8	2	Fraser
254	206	80	2.58	206	81	2.55	0	5	13	8	Fraser
255	252	95	2.65	263	100	2.63	11	107	41	(66)	Fraser
256	199	90	2.21	180	90	2.19	(19)	4	16	12	Fraser
257	254	93	2.73	257	95	2.70	3	59	24	(35)	Fraser
258	393	152	2.59	356	151	2.56	(37)	127	125	(2)	Fraser
259	357	139	2.57	361	142	2.54	4	133	105	(28)	Fraser
260	232	84	2.76	232	85	2.73	0	33	21	(12)	Fraser
261	58	19	3.05	53	19	3.02	(5)	3	4	1	Fraser
262	53	19	2.79	48	19	2.76	(5)	0	9	9	Fraser
263	51	18	2.83	46	18	2.80	(5)	11	6	(5)	Fraser
264	31	15	2.07	28	15	2.05	(3)	0	1	1	Fraser
265	169	60	2.82	170	61	2.79	1	38	27	(11)	Fraser
266	273	111	2.46	279	113	2.47	6	102	103	1	Fraser
267	674	277	2.43	611	275	2.41	(63)	90	134	44	Fraser
268	51	18	2.83	53	19	2.81	2	1	6	5	Garfield
269	359	131	2.74	376	135	2.79	17	17	29	12	Garfield
270	164	65	2.52	173	67	2.59	9	0	11	11	Garfield
271	194	66	2.94	209	67	3.12	15	3	27	24	Garfield
272	473	168	2.82	481	171	2.81	8	21	45	24	Garfield
273	98	37	2.65	100	38	2.62	2	3	6	3	Garfield
274	248	86	2.88	233	86	2.85	(15)	13	20	7	Garfield
275	288	98	2.94	270	97	2.95	(18)	20	36	16	Garfield
210	60	25	2.40	62	26	2.38	2	0	4	4	Gibson
211	105	34	3.09	140	37	3.79	35	0	3	3	Gibson
212	166	61	2.72	170	63	2.69	4	0	6	6	Gibson
213	170	61	2.79	171	62	2.76	1	4	9	5	Gibson
214	295	113	2.61	390	115	3.39	95	8	46	38	Gibson
215	83	33	2.52	90	36	2.49	7	0	4	4	Gibson
216	260	85	3.06	260	86	3.03	0	11	11	0	Gibson
217	89	29	3.07	91	30	3.04	2	1	3	2	Gibson
475	169	73	2.32	153	73	2.30	(16)	262	314	52	Hampton
476	262	118	2.22	238	118	2.20	(24)	73	79	6	Hampton
477	330	145	2.28	299	145	2.26	(31)	105	120	15	Hampton
478	49	19	2.58	54	21	2.55	5	361	219	(142)	Hampton
479	486	308	1.58	500	315	1.59	14	761	453	(308)	Hampton
480	955	564	1.69	866	564	1.67	(89)	171	172	1	Hampton
481	380	179	2.12	380	181	2.10	0	171	170	(1)	Hampton

**Bay County Traffic Analysis Zones - 2009 Base year Population and Total Employment**

TAZ	POP. 2005	OCC. HH 2005	PER HH 2005	Pop. 2009	Occ. HH 2009	Per HH 2009	Change in Pop. '05-'09	Total EMP '05	Total EMP '09	Change in EMP '05-'09	City/Township
482	485	186	2.61	485	188	2.58	0	233	207	(26)	Hampton
483	488	332	1.47	506	334	1.51	18	395	260	(135)	Hampton
484	1124	443	2.54	1168	455	2.57	44	456	283	(173)	Hampton
485	263	106	2.48	270	110	2.46	7	112	116	4	Hampton
486	901	347	2.60	900	350	2.57	(1)	108	127	19	Hampton
487	839	393	2.13	1071	396	2.71	232	798	559	(239)	Hampton
488	1281	562	2.28	1162	545	2.26	(119)	21	38	17	Hampton
489	564	199	2.83	578	206	2.81	14	24	27	3	Hampton
490	254	101	2.51	256	103	2.49	2	22	20	(2)	Hampton
491	457	160	2.86	414	160	2.83	(43)	45	36	(9)	Hampton
492	242	87	2.78	219	87	2.75	(23)	8	17	9	Hampton
285	119	48	2.48	120	49	2.45	1	1	10	9	Kawkawlin
286	56	17	3.29	51	17	3.26	(5)	1	2	1	Kawkawlin
287	566	220	2.57	585	222	2.64	19	95	131	36	Kawkawlin
288	162	67	2.42	147	67	2.40	(15)	26	22	(4)	Kawkawlin
289	740	304	2.43	673	304	2.41	(67)	278	302	24	Kawkawlin
290	475	210	2.26	474	211	2.25	(1)	133	150	17	Kawkawlin
291	793	317	2.50	802	319	2.51	9	151	154	3	Kawkawlin
292	568	185	3.07	565	186	3.04	(3)	35	76	41	Kawkawlin
293	152	53	2.87	138	53	2.84	(14)	10	22	12	Kawkawlin
294	792	305	2.60	720	300	2.57	(72)	19	38	19	Kawkawlin
295	89	29	3.07	81	29	3.04	(8)	7	12	5	Kawkawlin
296	59	22	2.68	61	23	2.66	2	4	10	6	Kawkawlin
297	176	67	2.63	205	79	2.60	29	29	38	9	Kawkawlin
298	136	54	2.52	124	54	2.49	(12)	215	174	(41)	Kawkawlin
299	270	107	2.52	275	110	2.50	5	351	327	(24)	Kawkawlin
493	244	89	2.74	244	90	2.71	0	12	46	34	Merritt
494	184	71	2.59	168	71	2.56	(16)	13	11	(2)	Merritt
495	83	34	2.44	82	35	5.36	(1)	5	15	10	Merritt
496	96	37	2.59	103	40	2.57	7	1	8	7	Merritt
497	60	23	2.61	55	23	2.58	(5)	0	7	7	Merritt
498	30	15	2.00	27	15	1.98	(3)	0	5	5	Merritt
499	272	111	2.45	274	113	2.43	2	66	68	2	Merritt
500	91	38	2.39	97	41	2.37	6	4	8	4	Merritt
501	362	131	2.76	331	131	2.73	(31)	56	49	(7)	Merritt
153	2	1	2.00	2	1	1.98	0	0	22	22	Midland
154	220	94	2.34	234	101	2.32	14	12	229	217	Midland
324	68	27	2.52	63	27	2.49	(5)	0	12	12	Monitor
325	159	53	3.00	166	56	2.97	7	0	7	7	Monitor
326	103	45	2.29	109	48	2.27	6	19	24	5	Monitor
327	18	7	2.57	17	7	2.54	(1)	0	3	3	Monitor
328	244	100	2.44	244	101	2.42	0	90	87	(3)	Monitor
329	340	167	2.04	314	164	2.02	(26)	45	81	36	Monitor
330	497	277	1.79	460	275	1.78	(37)	36	29	(7)	Monitor
331	310	155	2.00	287	155	1.98	(23)	200	209	9	Monitor
332	122	40	3.05	127	42	3.02	5	127	147	20	Monitor
333	353	127	2.78	377	137	2.75	24	54	64	10	Monitor
334	26	0	0.00	23	0	1.95	(3)	317	217	(100)	Monitor
335	476	201	2.37	488	208	2.34	12	36	45	9	Monitor
336	511	200	2.56	508	201	2.53	(3)	76	76	0	Monitor
337	475	176	2.70	478	179	2.67	3	98	104	6	Monitor
338	253	92	2.75	234	92	2.72	(19)	28	26	(2)	Monitor
339	17	6	2.83	16	6	2.80	(1)	179	102	(77)	Monitor
340	464	199	2.33	462	200	2.31	(2)	8	26	18	Monitor
341	291	129	2.26	842	241	3.49	551	307	323	16	Monitor
342	491	226	2.17	503	234	2.15	12	12	20	8	Monitor
343	1403	555	2.53	1497	590	2.54	94	349	364	15	Monitor
344	768	302	2.54	791	307	2.58	23	41	22	(19)	Monitor
345	554	203	2.73	551	204	2.70	(3)	531	622	91	Monitor
346	136	48	2.83	126	48	2.80	(10)	787	465	(322)	Monitor
347	169	64	2.64	170	65	2.61	1	7	14	7	Monitor
348	56	21	2.67	58	22	2.64	2	17	28	11	Monitor

**Bay County Traffic Analysis Zones - 2009 Base year Population and Total Employment**

TAZ	POP. 2005	OCC. HH 2005	PER HH 2005	Pop. 2009	Occ. HH 2009	Per HH 2009	Change in Pop. '05-'09	Total EMP '05	Total EMP '09	Change in EMP '05-'09	City/Township
349	272	106	2.57	252	106	2.54	(20)	3	14	11	Monitor
350	273	102	2.68	281	106	2.65	8	7	19	12	Monitor
351	488	185	2.64	451	185	2.61	(37)	108	147	39	Monitor
352	660	331	1.99	669	339	1.97	9	40	41	1	Monitor
353	141	60	2.35	130	60	2.33	(11)	449	313	(136)	Monitor
987	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	53	47	(6)	Monitor
988	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	873	750	(123)	Monitor
218	37	16	2.31	36	16	2.29	(1)	0	0	0	Mt. Forest
219	74	32	2.31	78	34	2.29	4	4	13	9	Mt. Forest
220	164	67	2.45	170	70	2.42	6	7	27	20	Mt. Forest
221	305	114	2.68	318	120	2.65	13	16	36	20	Mt. Forest
222	167	63	2.65	171	65	2.62	4	8	19	11	Mt. Forest
223	176	66	2.67	177	67	2.64	1	1	3	2	Mt. Forest
224	255	88	2.90	258	90	2.87	3	61	51	(10)	Mt. Forest
225	103	43	2.40	102	43	2.38	(1)	0	21	21	Mt. Forest
226	143	53	2.70	144	54	2.67	1	10	19	9	Mt. Forest
247	622	306	2.03	630	307	2.05	8	460	342	(118)	Pinc. City
248	451	186	2.42	405	186	2.40	(46)	253	205	(48)	Pinc. City
249	9	4	2.25	8	4	2.23	(1)	276	179	(97)	Pinc. City
250	256	125	2.05	230	125	2.03	(26)	231	96	(135)	Pinc. City
227	190	65	2.92	172	65	2.89	(18)	4	12	8	Pinc. Twp.
228	17	10	1.70	15	10	1.68	(2)	0	0	0	Pinc. Twp.
229	10	6	1.67	9	6	1.65	(1)	0	0	0	Pinc. Twp.
230	73	30	2.43	66	30	2.41	(7)	0	3	3	Pinc. Twp.
231	151	49	3.08	137	49	3.05	(14)	2	17	15	Pinc. Twp.
232	134	55	2.44	122	55	2.42	(12)	15	29	14	Pinc. Twp.
233	76	29	2.62	69	29	2.59	(7)	43	20	(23)	Pinc. Twp.
234	323	123	2.63	330	127	2.60	7	51	97	46	Pinc. Twp.
235	509	213	2.39	462	213	2.37	(47)	32	37	5	Pinc. Twp.
236	198	86	2.30	201	88	2.28	3	67	26	(41)	Pinc. Twp.
237	79	26	3.04	72	26	3.01	(7)	32	28	(4)	Pinc. Twp.
238	7	2	3.50	6	2	3.47	(1)	6	8	2	Pinc. Twp.
239	47	16	2.94	43	16	2.91	(4)	0	0	0	Pinc. Twp.
240	95	35	2.71	97	36	2.69	2	13	12	(1)	Pinc. Twp.
241	5	3	1.67	5	3	1.65	0	26	26	0	Pinc. Twp.
242	143	54	2.65	149	57	2.62	6	38	42	4	Pinc. Twp.
243	105	41	2.56	95	41	2.53	(10)	22	35	13	Pinc. Twp.
244	306	119	2.57	308	121	2.55	2	104	72	(32)	Pinc. Twp.
245	49	19	2.58	44	19	2.55	(5)	9	8	(1)	Pinc. Twp.
246	122	52	2.35	111	52	2.33	(11)	12	17	5	Pinc. Twp.
502	126	45	2.80	141	51	2.77	15	9	13	4	Portsmouth
503	99	46	2.15	102	48	2.13	3	14	26	12	Portsmouth
504	208	78	2.67	187	78	2.64	(21)	10	22	12	Portsmouth
505	211	78	2.71	190	78	2.68	(21)	56	58	2	Portsmouth
506	182	67	2.72	164	67	2.69	(18)	60	80	20	Portsmouth
507	213	95	2.24	192	95	2.22	(21)	41	40	(1)	Portsmouth
508	338	124	2.73	343	127	2.70	5	8	32	24	Portsmouth
509	338	136	2.49	352	139	2.53	14	32	49	17	Portsmouth
510	98	45	2.18	88	45	2.16	(10)	3	8	5	Portsmouth
511	364	149	2.44	370	153	2.42	6	40	49	9	Portsmouth
512	470	202	2.33	471	203	2.32	1	113	102	(11)	Portsmouth
513	308	134	2.30	278	134	2.28	(30)	19	4	(15)	Portsmouth
514	45	20	2.25	41	20	2.23	(4)	12	5	(7)	Portsmouth
515	236	89	2.65	239	91	2.63	3	7	18	11	Portsmouth
516	395	163	2.42	356	147	2.40	(39)	128	150	22	Portsmouth
300	216	75	2.88	231	78	2.96	15	5	25	20	Williams
301	196	65	3.02	218	73	2.99	22	4	24	20	Williams
302	114	39	2.92	105	39	2.89	(9)	4	8	4	Williams
303	864	322	2.68	798	318	2.67	(66)	96	68	(28)	Williams
304	382	137	2.79	353	136	2.76	(29)	11	20	9	Williams
305	397	145	2.74	404	149	2.71	7	62	58	(4)	Williams
306	48	16	3.00	44	16	2.97	(4)	61	54	(7)	Williams

**Bay County Traffic Analysis Zones - 2009 Base year Population and Total Employment**

TAZ	POP. 2005	OCC. HH 2005	PER HH 2005	Pop. 2009	Occ. HH 2009	Per HH 2009	Change in Pop. '05-'09	Total EMP '05	Total EMP '09	Change in EMP '05-'09	City/Township
307	365	145	2.52	337	144	2.49	(28)	220	159	(61)	Williams
308	491	187	2.63	517	196	2.64	26	5	21	16	Williams
309	389	153	2.54	395	157	2.52	6	41	45	4	Williams
310	612	221	2.77	687	248	2.77	75	47	71	24	Williams
311	57	23	2.48	53	23	2.46	(4)	0	8	8	Williams
312	206	84	2.45	211	87	2.43	5	41	34	(7)	Williams
313	86	33	2.61	88	34	2.58	2	214	269	55	Williams
314	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	1014	1014	0	Williams
315	18	10	1.80	17	10	1.78	(1)	27	16	(11)	Williams
316	16	6	2.67	15	6	2.64	(1)	0	3	3	Williams
317	31	15	2.07	29	15	2.05	(2)	1	0	(1)	Williams
318	214	68	3.15	215	69	3.12	1	5	15	10	Williams
319	161	60	2.68	149	60	2.65	(12)	0	3	3	Williams